$\begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 2 \end{bmatrix}$

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF NEVADA

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

4 MONICA CARR,

Plaintiff,

VS.

MSB NV-TX HOLDING, LLC,

Defendant.

Case No.: 2:25-cv-00033-GMN-NJK

ORDER ADOPTING REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION

Pending before the Court is the Report and Recommendation ("R&R"), (ECF No. 5), of United States Magistrate Judge Nancy J. Koppe, which recommends dismissing this case for lack of subject matter jurisdiction. (*See generally* R&R). The R&R notes that the complaint raises only state law causes of action and that diversity jurisdiction does not exist because Plaintiff is a resident of Nevada and Defendant is a corporation incorporated in Nevada. (*Id.* 1:20–26).

A party may file specific written objections to the findings and recommendations of a United States Magistrate Judge made pursuant to Local Rule IB 1-4. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B); D. Nev. R. IB 3-2. Upon the filing of such objections, the Court must make a *de novo* determination of those portions to which objections are made if the Magistrate Judge's findings and recommendations concern matters that may not be finally determined by a magistrate judge. D. Nev. R. IB 3-2(b). The Court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the findings or recommendations made by the Magistrate Judge. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); D. Nev. R. IB 3-2(b). Where a party fails to object, however, the Court is not required to conduct "any review at all . . . of any issue that is not the subject of an objection." *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 149 (1985) (citing 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)). Indeed, the Ninth Circuit has recognized that a district court is not required to review a magistrate judge's R&R where no objections have been

1	filed. See, e.g., United States v. Reyna-Tapia, 328 F.3d 1114, 1122 (9th Cir. 2003).
2	Here, no objections were filed, and the deadline to do so has passed. (See R&R, ECF
3	No. 5) (setting February 13, 2025, deadline for objections).
4	Accordingly,
5	IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the Report and Recommendation, (ECF No. 5), is
6	ACCEPTED and ADOPTED in full.
7	IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that this case is DISMISSED.
8	The Clerk of Court is kindly requested to close this case.
9	Dated this 19 day of February, 2025.
0	Ω
11	and the second
12	Gloria M. Navarro, District Judge United States District Court
13	
4	
15	
16	
17	
18	
9	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	